

Money spent in this fundamental work for maternal welfare will prove truly preventive, and will decrease rather than increase the burdens of taxation.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Mr. **ANDREWS**. There is one suggestion that we would like to make if it is in order. If one word were inserted in this bill, we believe that all that we ask for would be covered.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Where is that?

Mr. **ANDREWS**. It is in line 11, section 701, title 7; and if the word were inserted just before the word "maternal care", which would make it the third word in line 11, the line would then read, "And conducting special demonstration and research in contraception, maternal care, and other aspects of maternal and child health service." Just insert the one word "contraception."

The **CHAIRMAN**. Thank you very much.

Senator **CONNALLY**. Let me ask you one question. Is there any distinct opposition among the medical fraternity to these portions of the bill that you have addressed yourself to, on the idea that it is an invasion of their private practice? I have heard some rumors to that effect.

Mr. **ANDREWS**. I have never talked to the organized medical profession. I have talked to individual doctors and every one with whom I have talked is heartily in favor of that. There is some organized opposition in certain quarters, I understand, but when you approach the individual you do not find much of it.

Senator **CONNALLY**. Is there not some resistance in medical associations and organizations to the embarking by the Government by any means upon any kind of public-health measures and mothers' care upon the theory that it takes away from the private practitioners their opportunities?

Mr. **ANDREWS**. I suspect there would be some professional consideration there; but we do not feel it is of enough importance to pay attention to it.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Thank you very much. The next witness is Mr. Guy Irving Burch, of New York.

**STATEMENT OF GUY IRVING BURCH, DIRECTOR, POPULATION
REFERENCE BUREAU, NEW YORK CITY**

As a student of vital statistics and population growth during the past 12 years, I do not come before your committee to argue for or against this bill, but rather to present certain fundamental data which, it appears to me, should be considered in connection with this bill for economic security among the American people.

I am especially interested in two parts of this bill. First, in title II, headed "Appropriation for aid to dependent children", and, secondly in title VII, headed "Maternal and child health."

In section 201 of this act it is proposed that \$25,000,000 annually be appropriated from funds in the Federal Treasury for aid to dependent children. It is also proposed in this act that this sum be augmented by funds from the various States. These large sums of money, like much greater sums for unemployment and general relief running into the billions of dollars, will, of course, have their effects upon the standards of living of the self-supporting and negative reaction upon the size of their families. It is therefore of importance

that our efforts in relieving suffering be guided by a full knowledge of the facts and with a purpose of giving permanent relief instead of aggravating the situation so that our children and grandchildren, will be confronted with still greater problems.

Recent reports from the Federal Relief Administration indicate that there are approximately 4,000,000 families, or 16,000,000 persons, on Federal relief. Probably the number of individuals receiving public and private relief in this country today approaches 25,000,000, or approximately one-fifth of our entire population.

An analysis of persons on relief made by the Federal Relief Administration indicates that 42 percent were children under the age of 16 years and that large families, having six or more children! were bearing a large proportion of the hardships that go with unemployment distress.

Sample studies made by the Milbank Memorial Fund, I may add, one of the most reliable institutions in this country on matters of vital statistics, indicate that families experiencing unemployment have 48 percent higher birth rates than families not experiencing unemployment. Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer, of the University of Wisconsin, in a paper to the American Statistical Association, found that in Milwaukee families on relief had a birth rate 35 percent higher than self-supporting families.

I realize, of course, that during this depression there are many families experiencing unemployment and receiving relief that would ordinarily be self-supporting. I am not suggesting that such families should not experience the pleasures that come with the birth of children. Nor am I suggesting that the Government interfere with the increase in their numbers. I would like to make this clear. As a matter of fact, it is precisely because the Federal Government has interfered with poor families getting reliable information as to how to effectively control the number of their children that is causing much unnecessary suffering and hardship among these families. I refer to sections 211, 245, and 312 of the Criminal Code, which makes it a crime punishable by \$5,000 fine and 5 years in prison for even the medical profession to transport contraception supplies by mail, express, or common carriers from one hospital to another even in States which have no laws of any kind concerning contraception.

Dr. Raymond Pearl, of Johns Hopkins, in an exhaustive study for the Milbank Memorial Fund, reaches the conclusion that-

the national policy of prohibiting the free dissemination of accurate scientific information about birth-control methods is adding definitely and measurably to the difficulty of the problem of poverty and unemployment with which our children and our grandchildren will have to deal.

These sections of the Criminal Code mentioned above tie the hands of the medical profession and drive the distribution of contraceptives underground, and the wholesale bootlegging of fake contraceptives endangers the health of many thousands of mothers, which also endangers the health of their children. Largely because of the lack of reliable clinical methods of contraception it is estimated that there are more than 800,000 abortions in this country annually. This ignorance also contributes to a greater or lesser extent in the death of some 30,000 women and 200,000 infants annually. What a waste of human resources.

"This brings me to " title VII " of the Economic Security Act headed " Maternal and child health." Section 701 of this act would appropriate \$4,000,000 annually from funds in the Federal Treasury in order to enable the Federal Government to cooperate with State agencies of health in extending and strengthening services for the health of mothers and children! especially in rural areas and in areas, suffering from severe economic distress. I may say that it is in these very areas where sections 211, 245, and 312 of the Criminal Code do their greatest damage to the health of mothers and children, because reliable means of contraception must generally be transported to rural areas, which transportation is prohibited by the Criminal Code, and parents who are unemployed and families who are largely dependent upon charity clinics and public hospitals cannot afford bootleg methods of contraception which their more fortunate neighbors demand and get from the private physicians.

Many relief workers from the headquarters in Washington to the most distant rural areas realize the pressing need of making available reliable methods of contraception to families on relief, especially in rural districts, but their hands are tied by the Criminal Code.

Perhaps it is not in order to recommend that the Economic Security Act includes an amendment to sections 211, 245, and 312 of the Criminal Code which would enable the medical profession and through it the Relief Administration to make available contraceptive information to families on relief, but the facts would appear to indicate that until the hands of these agencies are set free in this respect the health and lives of many mothers and children will be endangered: and the existing evil may even be nourished on taxpayers' money which might be more wisely spent if relief were accompanied by contraceptive information.

The CHAIRMAN. I am placing in the record a letter and statement on the pending bill from Dr. Eveline M. Burns, of Columbia University, New York City.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1935.

HON. PAT HARRISON,

Chairman Committee on Finance,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN : I am enclosing herewith a statement in regard to the Economic Security Act (S. 1130) for the consideration of the committee. In this statement, I draw attention to certain features of the bill which in my judgment will render it unworkable and are likely to postpone rather than to encourage the establishment of unemployment insurance.

I have for many years been making a special study of the problems of unemployment compensation, both in this country and abroad, and have written various articles and read papers before the American Economic Association on the subject. In 1933 I was sent to Europe by Columbia University to investigate the operation of the German unemployment relief system. Last fall I acted as a consultant to the Committee on Economic Security. Since 1928 I have been a member of the graduate faculty of economics at Columbia University.

During the past few years I have played an active part in the movement to secure unemployment insurance legislation in New York State and have worked closely with such organizations as the New York Conference for unemployment insurance, the American Association for Social Security and other groups, and have appeared at Albany on several occasions. As vice president of the Consumers League of New York and member of the national board of the Y. W. C. A. I am continuously consulted by these organizations in regard to the problems of social legislation and especially of unemployment insurance.

Yours faithfully,

EVELINE M. BURNS.